

**Remarks**

Claims 1-7 were canceled in a Preliminary Amendment. Claims 8-27 are pending in the Application and have been rejected.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 8-27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner notes that every independent claim has, in part D, the expression “one or more fillers and filler deactivators.” The Examiner is confused about the meaning of this phrase. All the independent claims have been amended now to call for one or more fillers and one or more filler deactivators. Support for this resides, not only from the examples which show a filler and a deactivator, but also in the distributed property of the English language wherein “one or more” applies to the fillers and the filler deactivators.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Modic. These claims were canceled in the Preliminary Amendment and the Examiner has acknowledged their cancellation. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 8-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Modic in view of De Keyzer et al. and Prost. In view of the fact that each independent claim has specifically called for the polar engineering resin as being “polycarbonate,” and noting that none of the references disclose polycarbonate, it is submitted that this rejection fails.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 8-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. in view of Huff. Huff discloses overmolding of an elastomer onto a nylon article (an automotive radiator). Since the independent claims now call for polycarbonate as the polar engineering resin, it is submitted that this rejection is no longer viable.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 8-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakashima et al. The Examiner argues that Claim 5 of Nakashima calls for the addition of aramide fibers. The Examiner takes the position that these aramide fibers would be molded in the resin and thus that they are “overmolded.” First, there is no disclosure that the aramide fibers would remain in fiber form when incorporated into the flame resistant polymer. This appears to be supposition by the Examiner. Second, there is a possibility that more space could be developed around each fiber because they are not “overmolded” in the resin. This happens when mixing incompatible resins and particularly when incorporating small spherical-like particles in an incompatible resin. In such an instance, void space usually results. Third, the Examiner states that although there are no examples wherein all of Applicant’s features are present in the combination, it would necessarily be obvious in the absence of any showing or surprising or unexpected results. There is no support in any case law for this position of the Examiner. Unexpected results are only useful when all the elements in the combination are present. If all the elements in a combination are present, but the result is not known, then the absence of unexpected results could be applied in a rejection.

It is also noted that the Nakashima et al. specification does not seem to support Claim 5 with respect to the aramide fibers. Nevertheless, it is noted that none of the patent application discloses polycarbonate.

Lastly, it is noted that the melt flow rates of the various references are not according to “Conditional L.” Melt flow rates using conditions not in Condition L” cannot be compared with one another.

In the Japanese equivalent application, references D1 and D2 were applied by the Examiner. These references are being cited to the Examiner for consideration.

### Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks, and the citation of additional prior art, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and such is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 23 September, 2009

/Gregory N. Clements/  
Gregory N. Clements  
Registration No.: 30,713  
Attorney for Applicant

**CLEMENTS | BERNARD**  
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 250  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211 USA  
Telephone: 704.790.3600  
Facsimile: 704.366.9744  
[gclements@worldpatents.com](mailto:gclements@worldpatents.com)